

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 6:24-CR-03073-BCW-1
	)	
SHAWN O. BELL,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge David P. Rush’s Report and Recommendations (Doc. #74) concerning Defendant’s first and second motions to reopen suppression hearing (Docs. #55, #71).

On December 7, 2022, Defendant was charged by a previous indictment in United States v. Shawn O. Bell, Case No. 6:22-CR-03151-BCW-1. On February 13, 2024, the Court denied Defendant’s motion to suppress in that matter. On May 21, 2024, the Court dismissed the previous indictment without prejudice for violation of Defendant’s rights under the Speedy Trial Act. On June 26, 2024, Defendant was reindicted in this matter as part of the same overall prosecution. (Doc. #1). On March 26, 2025, the Court granted Defendant’s request to proceed pro se. (Doc. #44).

On April 15, 2025, Defendant filed his first motion to reopen suppression hearing, seeking to reopen the July 31, 2023, suppression hearing held in Case No. 6:22-CR-03151-BCW-1. (Doc. #55). On April 24, 2025, Judge Rush held a hearing on the motion. (Doc. #67). On May 1, 2025, Defendant filed his second motion to reopen suppression hearing, reasserting the same arguments made in his first motion. (Doc. #71). On May 2, 2025, Judge Rush issued the instant Report and Recommendations recommending the Court deny Defendant’s motions. (Doc. #74).

On May 6, 2025, Defendant filed pro se correspondence, which the Court construes as objections to the instant Report and Recommendations. (Doc. #77). Defendant reasserts arguments previously raised with respect to whether probable cause existed to support the search at issue, but Defendant does not address the basis upon which Judge Rush recommended the motion be denied. Defendant's objections are therefore non-responsive to the Report and Recommendations.

The Court, after an independent review of the record and the applicable law, adopts the Magistrate's Report and Recommendations. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Magistrate's Report and Recommendations be attached to and made part of this Order (Doc. #74). It is further

ORDERED Defendant's first and second motions to reopen suppression hearing (Docs. #55, #71) are DENIED for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendations.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 7, 2025

/s/ Brian C. Wimes

JUDGE BRIAN C. WIMES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT